

From: [Jay Field](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: Re: Hit/No-Hit Classifications
Date: 10/31/2010 08:04 PM

Eric,
I already have the hit/no-hit classification. According to Lucinda, we agree on the T (test) and C (control), it's only the T/C values that don't match (due to rounding). Unless LWG wants to continue the discussion, I think the issue has been resolved.
Jay

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

Jay, do you still need this. This is the only thing that I have.
I do
not think this has everything you are looking for.

Eric

(See attached file: EPA_2009_station_hit_levels_LWG.xlsx)

From: Jay Field <Jay.Field@noaa.gov>
To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Robert Neely <Robert.Neely@noaa.gov>
Date: 10/30/2010 05:21 PM
Subject: Re: Hit/No-Hit Classifications

Eric,
I am reviewing the hit/no-hit classifications. At the meeting at Windward with LWG, I requested a table of LWG's test results (a table with response values for test and control, control-adjusted values, statistical significance, and toxicity classification level for all 4 endpoints (as I provided). I need this file to complete my review. Also, it would be helpful if LWG provided a detailed listing of the discrepancies they have identified. As I mentioned on the phone, I did not use the tox classifications for the individual endpoints in my model

development or evaluation (in the files I sent, rtox_hy and rtox_ch are the relevant endpoints for comparison with LWG's results).
thanks,
Jay

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

All, I forwarded the hit/no-hit classifications that Jay prepared in

February (attached) to John Toll so we can resolve any differences.
Yesterday, John and Jim McKenna called me. Apparently, they were

unable

to verify the results. They identified two discrepancies with Jay's

hit

classifications.

1) Though it seemed that Jay tested for statistical difference from control, it did not appear that any hit classifications were

eliminated

based on this (i.e., based on no statistical difference from control).
This affected 50 Chironomus survival results.
2) The T and C data match but the T/C does not match.
At least 22
Hyaella biomass stations are affected.

I understand from Burt that this data has been verified in some way by the government team. However, I have not seen the results of the verification. I someone has an email or something that documents

this,

please send it to me.

John left a voice message with Jay. However, I am not sure Jay is around. Jay if you are checking email, can you provide some illumination. It might be good to give John Toll a call. He is at 206-812-5433. I would like this resolved asap. It seems that we

should

be able to quickly resolve any discrepancies on this fairly basic

topic

very quickly.

Thanks, Eric

(See attached file: CH10_Tox_100117.DBF)(See attached
file:
HY28_Tox_091001.DBF)

--
Jay Field
Assessment and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov

--
Jay Field
Assessment and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov